

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/989,061	YASUOKA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jennifer M. Kennedy	2812	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Jennifer M. Kennedy. (3) _____

(2) Mitchell W. Shapiro. (4) _____

Date of Interview: December 1, 2003.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 13, 24, 59, 60, 61, and 62.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: _____

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

JMK

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The examiner noted that the case contained patentable subject matter, however the claims did not clearly claim the patentable subject matter. The examiner believes that the claims needed to be amended to clearly state that the portions had gaps therebetween and that the third insulating film portions covered both at least one of said first insulating film portion and at least one of said second insulating film portions. The examiner and applicant's representative studied each independent claim in order to agree on a possible claim language to incorporate the patentable subject matter.